arXiv:1207.5533v1 [math.AG] 23 Jul 2012

# ON A HODGE THEORETIC PROPERTY OF THE KÜNNETH MAP IN PERIODIC CYCLIC HOMOLOGY

D. SHKLYAROV

Abstract. We prove that the standard Künneth map in periodic cyclic homology of differential $\mathbb{Z}/2$-graded algebras is compatible with a generalization of the Hodge filtration.

## 1. Introduction

The periodic cyclic homology, viewed as a functor on the category of unital associative algebras (say, over a field $\mathbb{K}$), is known to satisfy the 'Künneth property' [3]. Namely, recall that the periodic cyclic homology is a module over the algebra $\mathbb{K}[u, u^{-1}]$ where $u$ is a canonical periodicity map [7]. To avoid technical issues, let us consider only those algebras for which the corresponding $\mathbb{K}[u, u^{-1}]$-modules are finitely generated. Under this assumption, the $\mathbb{K}[u, u^{-1}]$-modules are, in fact, free (of finite rank) due to the presence of certain $\mathbb{Z}$-gradings in the story. Using this interpretation of the periodic cyclic homology as a (super-)vector bundle over the punctured $u$-line, the Künneth property is the claim that the tensor product of the bundles associated with two algebras is naturally isomorphic to the bundle associated with the tensor product of the algebras. An explicit canonical isomorphism, which we will call *the* non-commutative Künneth map, is described in [7]. The formula given in *loc. cit.* extends easily to the case of differential $\mathbb{Z}/2$-graded algebras (cf. [11]), and it is this extension that we will consider in the present work (from now on, 'differential $\mathbb{Z}/2$-graded' will be abbreviated to 'dg'). The only essential difference between the associative and the dg cases is that in the latter case the algebra $\mathbb{K}[u, u^{-1}]$ gets replaced by the field $\mathbb{K}((u)) := \mathbb{K}[[u]][u^{-1}]$ and, as a result, the periodic cyclic homology is interpreted as a bundle over the punctured *formal u-disk* in place of the $u$-line.

The periodic cyclic homology of dg algebras is anticipated to carry a Hodge-like structure [4, 5, 6], and the question that has inspired the present work is whether or not this conjectural structure will be compatible with the non-commutative Künneth map. What we will show is that the non-commutative Künneth map respects one of the ingredients of the structure called *the (formal) de Rham data* [4]. The de Rham data on the periodic cyclic homology, an analog of the Hodge filtration, comprises two components: a canonical connection on the underlying

---

This research was supported by the ERC Starting Independent Researcher Grant StG No. 204757-TQFT (K. Wendland PI).

bundle over the punctured formal disk and a canonical extension of the bundle over the formal disk coming from the negative cyclic homology (see [4, 10] for more details). That the non-commutative Künneth map is compatible with the extensions is an obvious consequence of the explicit formula (roughly, the Künneth map at the level of complexes is 'regular' at $u = 0$). The only non-trivial part of the claim is that the map is compatible with the connections.

Interest in the above compatibility question can be motivated by the classical fact that the Künneth map in the cohomology of complex algebraic varieties respects Deligne's mixed Hodge structures. However, the aim we really had in mind was to obtain abstract algebraic versions of various Thom-Sebastiani-type results in singularity theory such as, for instance, the Thom-Sebastiani formula for Steenbrink's Hodge filtration on the vanishing cohomology of isolated singularities [9, Sect.8]. The latter calculates the Hodge filtration for the direct sum $w_1 \oplus w_2$ of two singularities in terms of the same data for $w_1$ and $w_2$. This result, as well as the original Thom-Sebastiani theorem and some other facts of similar nature, can be deduced from a Künneth property for the Gauss-Manin systems and the Brieskorn lattices (see Lemma 8.7 in *loc.cit.*) or, equivalently, for the Fourier-Laplace transforms thereof (see [8, Sect.3] where this is discussed in the framework of tame polynomials). This Künneth property is a special case of our result. Namely, associated with any singularity $w$ is a dg algebra $A_w$ which 'controls', in some precise sense, the category of matrix factorizations of $w$ (see [1]). The definition of $A_w$ depends on some choices but given any two singularities, one can easily arrange for $A_{w_1}$, $A_{w_2}$ and $A_{w_1 \oplus w_2}$ to satisfy $A_{w_1 \oplus w_2} \simeq A_{w_1} \otimes A_{w_2}$. Furthermore, by the main result of [10] the de Rham data on the periodic cyclic homology of $A_w$ is isomorphic, up to a 'Tate twist', to the Fourier-Laplace transform of the Gauss-Manin system (together with the Brieskorn lattice) of $w$. Finally, an explicit isomorphism used in the proof of the latter fact can easily be shown to transform the non-commutative Künneth map into the one described in [9, Lemma 8.7].

**Conventions.** Throughout the paper, we will work over some ground field $\mathbb{K}$ of characteristic 0. Given a $\mathbb{Z}/2$-graded space $V$, $\Pi V$ will stand for $V$ with the reversed $\mathbb{Z}/2$-grading, the parity of $v \in V$ will be denoted by $|v|$, and the corresponding element of $\Pi V$ will be denoted by $\Pi v$. We will follow all the standard conventions of super linear algebra (such as the Koszul rule of signs, etc.). Finally, only *unital* dg algebras will be considered.

## 2. Reminder

The aim of this section is to remind the reader all the definitions that are needed to state our main result. Namely, we will recall the definition of the periodic cyclic homology of a unital dg algebra[1], the explicit formula for the non-commutative Künneth map from[2] [7, Section 4.3], and, finally, a formula for the canonical connection on the periodic cyclic homology [10].

Let $A = (A, d)$ stand for a dg algebra and set $\mathsf{C}(A) := \bigoplus_{n\geq 0} A \otimes (\Pi A)^{\otimes n}$. The latter is the underlying $\mathbb{Z}/2$-graded space of the Hochschild complex of $A$. The Hochschild differential, $b$, can be conveniently written in terms of some auxiliary operator on $\mathsf{C}(A)$ which we will now introduce.

Writing the elements of $A \otimes (\Pi A)^{\otimes n}$ as $a_0[a_1|a_2|\ldots|a_n]$, we set[3]

$$\tau_{n+1}(a_0[a_1|a_2|\ldots|a_n]) = (-1)^{|\Pi a_0|\sum_{i=1}^{n}|\Pi a_i|} a_1[a_2|\ldots|a_n|a_0]$$

$$\delta^{(0)}_{n+1}(a_0[a_1|a_2|\ldots|a_n]) = da_0[a_1|a_2|\ldots|a_n]$$

$$\mu^{(0)}_{n+1}(a_0[a_1|a_2|\ldots|a_n]) = \begin{cases} 0 & n = 0 \\ (-1)^{|a_0|} a_0 a_1[a_2|\ldots|a_n] & n \geq 1 \end{cases}$$

$$\delta^{(i)}_{n+1} := \tau^{-i}_{n+1}\,\delta^{(0)}_{n+1}\,\tau^{i}_{n+1}, \quad \mu^{(i)}_{n+1} := \tau^{-i}_{n}\,\mu^{(0)}_{n+1}\,\tau^{i}_{n+1}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n$$

Then the Hochschild differential $b$ is given by

$$b = b(\delta) + b(\mu)$$

where $b(\delta)_{n+1} = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \delta^{(i)}_{n+1}$ and $b(\mu)_{n+1} = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \mu^{(i)}_{n+1}$.

The periodic cyclic homology of $A$ is the cohomology of the complex $(\mathsf{C}(A)((u)), b + uB)$ where $u$ is an even variable, $\mathsf{C}(A)((u))$ is the space of formal Laurent series with coefficients in $\mathsf{C}(A)$, and $B$ is Connes' differential:

$$B = (1 - \tau^{-1})hN$$

where $N_{n+1} = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \tau^{i}_{n+1}$ and $h_{n+1}(a_0[a_1|a_2|\ldots|a_n]) = 1[a_0|a_1|a_2|\ldots|a_n]$. We will be working exclusively with the *normalized* version of the above complex. Namely, consider the subspace $\mathsf{C}'(A) \subset \mathsf{C}(A)$ spanned by $a_0[a_1|a_2|\ldots|a_n]$ with at least one of $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ equal to 1 (the unit of $A$). This subspace is preserved by both $b$ and $B$. Let

$$\overline{\mathsf{C}}(A) := \mathsf{C}(A)/\mathsf{C}'(A) = \bigoplus_{n\geq 0} A \otimes (\Pi\,\overline{A})^{\otimes n}, \quad \overline{A} := A/\mathbb{K}$$

---

[1] The formulas will be equivalent, modulo minor details, to those used in [2].

[2] Formally, the dg case is not discussed in [7]. However, once the non-trivial grading is taken care of (cf. [11]), the formula is known to work in the dg setting as well.

[3] In these formulas, as well as in the rest of the paper, we use the following shorthand notation: given an operator on $\mathsf{C}(A)$ we equip the notation for the operator with the subscript $n+1$ to denote its restriction onto $A \otimes (\Pi A)^{\otimes n}$. The same convention will be used for operators on the normalized Hochschild complex.

We will use the same notation $b$, $B$ for the induced differentials on $\overline{\mathsf{C}}(A)$ (the formula for $B$ on the quotient simplifies to $B = hN$). The natural morphism of complexes

$$(\mathsf{C}(A)((u)), b + uB) \to (\overline{\mathsf{C}}(A)((u)), b + uB),$$

is known to be a quasi-isomorphism.

Let us recall now the explicit formula for the non-commutative Künneth map. Consider two dg algebras, $A'$ and $A''$. Define

$$k : \overline{\mathsf{C}}(A') \otimes \overline{\mathsf{C}}(A'') \to \overline{\mathsf{C}}(A' \otimes A'')$$

as follows. For $a_0'[a_1'|\dots|a_n'] \in \overline{\mathsf{C}}(A')$ and $a_0''[a_1''|\dots|a_m''] \in \overline{\mathsf{C}}(A'')$ set

$$k(a_0'[a_1'|\dots|a_n'] \otimes a_0''[a_1''|\dots|a_m'']) = (-1)^{*}(a_0' \otimes a_0'')sh[a_1' \otimes 1|\dots|a_n' \otimes 1|1 \otimes a_1''|\dots|1 \otimes a_m''] \tag{2.1}$$

Here $* = |a_0''|(|\Pi a_1'| + \dots + |\Pi a_n'|)$ and $sh$ stands for the sum (with signs) over all the $(n, m)$-shuffles, i.e. the permutations that shuffle the $a'$-terms with the $a''$-terms while preserving the order of the former and the latter. The signs are computed by the rule that the transposition $[\dots|x|y|\dots] \to [\dots|y|x|\dots]$ contributes $(-1)^{|x||y|}$ (for $x$ and $y$ having definite parities).

The key property of $k$ is that it commutes with the Hochschild differentials

$$b\,k = k\,(b \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes b) \tag{2.2}$$

and induces a quasi-isomorphism of the corresponding complexes (this is the 'Künneth theorem for Hochschild homology'). However, it does not induce a morphism of the *cyclic* complexes since it does not respect $B$. A first-order correction (in $u$) to $k$ turns out to solve this problem. Namely, let

$$K(a_0'[a_1'|\dots|a_n'] \otimes a_0''[a_1''|\dots|a_m'']) = (-1)^{**}(1 \otimes 1)Sh[a_0' \otimes 1|\dots|a_n' \otimes 1|1 \otimes a_0''|\dots|1 \otimes a_m'']$$

with $** = |a_0'| + |\Pi a_1'| + \dots + |\Pi a_n'|$ and the operator $Sh$ defined by the same formula as $sh$ but with the sum extended over all the *cyclic* shuffles. The latter cyclically permute $a_0', \dots, a_n'$ and $a_0'', \dots, a_m''$, and then shuffle the $a'$-terms with the $a''$-terms so that $a_0'$ stays to the left of $a_0''$ (see [7, Section 4.3.2]). The operator $k + uK$ commutes with the cyclic differentials

$$(b + uB)\,(k + uK) = (k + uK)\,((b + uB) \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes (b + uB)) \tag{2.3}$$

and the induced morphism of complexes

$$\big((\overline{\mathsf{C}}(A') \otimes \overline{\mathsf{C}}(A''))((u)), (b + uB) \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes (b + uB)\big) \to (\overline{\mathsf{C}}(A' \otimes A'')((u)), b + uB)$$

is a quasi-isomorphism. This is the 'Künneth theorem for periodic cyclic homology'.

Finally, let us describe the canonical connection on the periodic cyclic homology. We will need some terminology from [10]. Namely, let $(\mathsf{C}, b, B)$ be a mixed complex, i.e. a $\mathbb{Z}/2$-graded vector space endowed with an (ordered) pair of anti-commuting differentials. Then a *u-connection* on this mixed complex is an (even) differential operator of the form $\nabla = \frac{d}{du} + A(u)$, $A(u) \in \mathrm{End}(\mathsf{C})((u))$ satisfying

$$[\,\nabla\,,\, b + uB\,] = \frac{1}{2u}(b + uB) \tag{2.4}$$

In particular, a $u$-connection induces a connection on the cohomology of $(\mathsf{C}((u)), b+uB)$ viewed as a bundle over the formal punctured disk.

Let $A$ be a dg algebra. Consider the following operators on $\overline{\mathsf{C}}(A)$:

$$\gamma_{n+1} = n \cdot id_{n+1}, \quad U_{n+1} = \mu^{(0)}_{n+1}\delta^{(1)}_{n+1}, \quad V_{n+1} = h_{n+1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=0}^{n-i}\tau^{-j}_{n+1}\delta^{(i)}_{n+1},$$

**Proposition 2.1.**

$$\nabla_A = \frac{d}{du} - \frac{U}{2u^2} - \frac{V+\gamma}{2u} \tag{2.5}$$

*is a $u$-connection on $(\overline{\mathsf{C}}(A), b, B)$.*

The induced connection on the periodic cyclic homology is the aforementioned canonical connection, the main ingredient of the de Rham data.

Proposition 2.1 is a straightforward consequence of [10, Corollary 3.7] where a $u$-connection $\nabla^{un}$ on the *non-normalized* cyclic complex is presented. Inspecting the formula for $\nabla^{un}$ shows that $\nabla^{un}$ preserves the subspace $\mathsf{C}'(A) \subset \mathsf{C}(A)$ and the induced operator on the quotient $\overline{\mathsf{C}}(A)((u)) = \mathsf{C}(A)/\mathsf{C}'(A)((u))$ is precisely (2.5).

**Remark 2.2.** The origin of the formula (2.5), as well as other similar formulas from [10], is the non-commutative Cartan homotopy formula of [2] (or, rather, a very special case of it known as Rinehart's formula). Namely, the relation (2.4) for the operator (2.5) is equivalent to

$$[b + uB, U + uV] = ub(\delta) \tag{2.6}$$

which can be deduced from [2, Eq.(2.1)] by substituting the differential $d$ of the dg algebra $A$ for the Hochschild cochain $D$ (in the notation of *loc.cit.*).

## 3. Main result

As we explained in the Introduction, our main result says that the non-commutative Künneth map is compatible with the canonical connections. The actual statement is at the level of the cyclic complexes, and to formulate it, we will need yet another piece of terminology from [10]. Namely, given two mixed complexes with $u$-connections, $(\mathsf{C}', b', B', \frac{d}{du}+A'(u))$ and $(\mathsf{C}'', b'', B'', \frac{d}{du}+A''(u))$, a *morphism* from the former to the latter is a $\mathbb{K}((u))$-linear morphism of complexes

$$f(u) : (\mathsf{C}'((u)), b' + uB') \to (\mathsf{C}''((u)), b'' + uB'')$$

satisfying the following condition: the morphism

$$\frac{df(u)}{du} + A''(u)f(u) - f(u)A'(u) : (\mathsf{C}'((u)), b' + uB') \to (\mathsf{C}''((u)), b'' + uB'')$$

is homotopic to 0. This condition guarantees that the map, induced by $f(u)$ on the cohomology, respects the induced connections.

Now we are able to state the main result:

**Theorem 3.1.** *The cyclic Künneth map $k + uK$ is a morphism of mixed complexes with $u$-connections*

$$\big(\overline{\mathsf{C}}(A') \otimes \overline{\mathsf{C}}(A''), b \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes b, B \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes B, \nabla_{A'} \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes \nabla_{A''})\big) \to (\overline{\mathsf{C}}(A' \otimes A''), b, B, \nabla_{A' \otimes A''})$$

The complete proof is a long and tedious calculation which, we believe, would have been quite hard to follow. Therefore, we will present only a detailed sketch of the full proof including all the principal formulas and intermediate steps.

To shorten some formulas below, we will write expressions like

$$b\,k - k\,(b \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes b), \quad U\,K - K\,(U \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes U), \quad \text{etc.}$$

using the commutator[4] notation:

$$[b, k], \quad [U, K], \quad \text{etc.}$$

Also, we will omit the symbol $\otimes$ in the notation for the elements of $A' \otimes A''$. Namely, $a'$ (resp. $a''$) will stand either for an element of $A'$ (resp. $A''$) or for the corresponding element $a' \otimes 1$ (resp. $1 \otimes a''$) of $A' \otimes A''$, and $a' \otimes a''$ will be shortened to $a'a''$. The unit $1 \otimes 1$ of $A' \otimes A''$ will be denoted by $\mathbf{1}$.

We have to prove that the morphism

$$-2u^2 \frac{d(k + uK)}{du} + [U + u(V + \gamma), k + uK]$$

is homotopic to 0. Consider its $u$-expansion:

$$[U, k] + u\,([U, K] + [V + \gamma, k])) + u^2\,([V + \gamma, K] - 2K)$$

Obviously, the coefficient at $u^2$ equals 0. Indeed, $[\gamma, K] = 2K$ and $[V, K] = 0$ simply by the definition of the operators involved and the fact that we are working with the normalized complexes. The coefficient at $u^0$ is also easily seen to vanish. The proof of this is based on the explicit formula for $U$

$$U(a_0[a_1|\dots|a_n]) = -a_0 da_1[a_2|\dots|a_n]$$

---

[4] Of course, the "commutator" stands for the *super*-commutator when both operators involved are odd.

and the obvious fact that the sum in the right-hand side of (2.1) involves elements of the following two types only:

$$\pm a_0' a_0''[a_1'|\ldots] \quad \text{or} \quad \pm\, a_0' a_0''[a_1''|\ldots]$$

Finally, note that the coefficient at $u$ equals

$$[U, K] + [V, k] \tag{3.1}$$

since, clearly, $[\gamma, k] = 0$.

Thus, the only non-obvious part of Theorem 3.1 is the following statement:

**Proposition 3.2.** *The operator (3.1) viewed as a morphism*

$$\big((\overline{\mathsf{C}}(A') \otimes \overline{\mathsf{C}}(A''))((u)), (b + uB) \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes (b + uB)\big) \to (\overline{\mathsf{C}}(A' \otimes A'')((u)), b + uB)$$

*is homotopic to 0.*

The rest of this section is devoted to proving this statement. The layout of the proof is as follows: We will introduce an odd operator

$$H : \overline{\mathsf{C}}(A') \otimes \overline{\mathsf{C}}(A'') \to \overline{\mathsf{C}}(A' \otimes A''),$$

compute the difference between (3.1) and $[b + uB, H]$, and show that the difference is homotopic to 0 for some simple reasons.

Let

$$k^{(r,s)} : \big(A' \otimes (\Pi\, \overline{A'})^{\otimes n}\big) \otimes \big(A'' \otimes (\Pi\, \overline{A''})^{\otimes m}\big) \to \overline{\mathsf{C}}(A' \otimes A'') \quad (r \le n, s \le m)$$

denote the linear operator defined by

$$k^{(r,s)}(a_0'[a_1'|\ldots|a_n'] \otimes a_0''[a_1''|\ldots|a_m'']) = (-1)^{**}\mathbf{1}\, sh^{(r,s)}[a_0'|\ldots|a_n'|a_0''|\ldots|a_m''] \tag{3.2}$$

where $**$ is the same as in the definition of $K$ and $sh^{(r,s)}$ denotes the sum over those (non-cyclic) $(n+1, m+1)$-shuffles that do not switch $a_r'$ and $a_s''$. The operator $H$ is defined as follows: Its restriction to $\big(A' \otimes (\Pi\, \overline{A'})^{\otimes n}\big) \otimes \big(A'' \otimes (\Pi\, \overline{A''})^{\otimes m}\big)$ is given by

$$H = -\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{r=0}^{n-i} \sum_{s=0}^{m} k^{(r,s)}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r}\delta_{n+1}^{(i)} \otimes \tau_{m+1}^{-s}) - \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{r=0}^{n} \sum_{s=0}^{m-i} k^{(r,s)}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r} \otimes \tau_{m+1}^{-s}\delta_{m+1}^{(i)})$$

Observe that $[b + uB, H] = [b(\mu), H]$. Indeed, $[b(\delta), H] = 0$ since $b(\delta)$ (anti-)commutes with shuffles, cyclic permutations, and $\delta^{(i)}$'s. Also, $[B, H] = 0$ since we are working with the normalized complexes. Therefore, we need to compute the difference between (3.1) and $[b(\mu), H]$.

**Lemma 3.3.**

$$Vk - K(U \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes U) = b(\mu)^{\dagger} H + H(b(\mu) \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes b(\mu))$$

*where* $b(\mu)^{\dagger}$ *stands for the following truncation of* $b(\mu)$*:* $b(\mu)^{\dagger}_{n+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \mu_{n+1}^{(i)}$.

**Proof.** Let us introduce some further notation. We will denote by $k_0^{(r,s)}$ the linear operator defined similarly to $k^{(r,s)}$ but with the sum taken only over those shuffles that put $a'_r$ and $a''_s$ next to each other:

$$k_0^{(r,s)}(a'_0[a'_1|\dots|a'_n]\otimes a''_0[a''_1|\dots|a''_m])=(-1)^{**}(-1)^{***}\mathbf{1}\,[\dots]$$

where $**$ is as before (see the definitions of $K$ and $k^{(r,s)}$), $[\dots]$ stands for the following sum

$$[\underbrace{a'_0|\dots|a'_{r-1}|a''_0|\dots|a''_{s-1}}_{\text{sum over }(r,s)-\text{shuffles}}|a'_r|a''_s|\underbrace{a'_{r+1}|\dots|a'_n|a''_{s+1}|\dots|a''_m}_{\text{sum over }(n-r,m-s)-\text{shuffles}}] \tag{3.3}$$

and $(-1)^{***}$ is the sign coming from the shuffles that transform $[a'_0|\dots|a'_n|a''_0|\dots|a''_m]$ into (3.3). It is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned}b(\mu)^\dagger k^{(r,s)}&=\mu^{(r+s+1)}k_0^{(r,s)}+\\
+k^{(r-1,s)}\sum_{j=0}^{r-1}\mu_{n+1}^{(j)}\otimes 1&+k^{(r,s)}\sum_{j=r}^{n-1}\mu_{n+1}^{(j)}\otimes 1+\\
+k^{(r,s-1)}\sum_{j=0}^{s-1}1\otimes\mu_{m+1}^{(j)}&+k^{(r,s)}\sum_{j=s}^{m-1}1\otimes\mu_{m+1}^{(j)}\end{aligned}$$

Indeed, let $\mathbf{1}\,[\dots|x|y|\dots]$ ($x$ is at the $i$th spot) be one of the summands that enter the expression for $k^{(r,s)}(a'_0[\dots]\otimes a''_0[\dots])$. Upon applying $\mu^{(i)}$ this summand will not cancel out with anything else if and only if $x$ and $y$ cannot be switched, i.e. in one of the following three cases:

$$x=a'_r,\ y=a''_s\quad\text{or}\quad x=a'_k,\ y=a'_{k+1}\quad\text{or}\quad x=a''_l,\ y=a''_{l+1}$$

The corresponding summands will contribute to the first, the second, and the third lines in the right-hand side of the formula, respectively.

According to the above formula

$$\begin{aligned}-b(\mu)^\dagger H&=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{r=0}^{n-i}\sum_{s=0}^{m}b(\mu)^\dagger k^{(r,s)}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r}\delta_{n+1}^{(i)}\otimes\tau_{m+1}^{-s})+\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{r=0}^{n}\sum_{s=0}^{m-i}b(\mu)^\dagger k^{(r,s)}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r}\otimes\tau_{m+1}^{-s}\delta_{m+1}^{(i)})\\
&=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{r=0}^{n-i}\sum_{s=0}^{m}\mu^{(r+s+1)}k_0^{(r,s)}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r}\delta_{n+1}^{(i)}\otimes\tau_{m+1}^{-s})+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{r=0}^{n-i}\sum_{s=0}^{m}\sum_{j=0}^{r-1}k^{(r-1,s)}(\mu_{n+1}^{(j)}\tau_{n+1}^{-r}\delta_{n+1}^{(i)}\otimes\tau_{m+1}^{-s})\\
&+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{r=0}^{n-i}\sum_{s=0}^{m}\sum_{j=r}^{n-1}k^{(r,s)}(\mu_{n+1}^{(j)}\tau_{n+1}^{-r}\delta_{n+1}^{(i)}\otimes\tau_{m+1}^{-s})-\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{r=0}^{n-i}\sum_{s=0}^{m}\sum_{j=0}^{s-1}k^{(r,s-1)}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r}\delta_{n+1}^{(i)}\otimes\mu_{m+1}^{(j)}\tau_{m+1}^{-s})\\
&-\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{r=0}^{n-i}\sum_{s=0}^{m}\sum_{j=s}^{m-1}k^{(r,s)}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r}\delta_{n+1}^{(i)}\otimes\mu_{m+1}^{(j)}\tau_{m+1}^{-s})+\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{r=0}^{n}\sum_{s=0}^{m-i}\mu^{(r+s+1)}k_0^{(r,s)}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r}\otimes\tau_{m+1}^{-s}\delta_{m+1}^{(i)})\end{aligned}$$

$$+\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{r=0}^{n}\sum_{s=0}^{m-i}\sum_{j=0}^{r-1} k^{(r-1,s)}(\mu_{n+1}^{(j)}\tau_{n+1}^{-r}\otimes\tau_{m+1}^{-s}\delta_{m+1}^{(i)}) + \sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{r=0}^{n}\sum_{s=0}^{m-i}\sum_{j=r}^{n-1} k^{(r,s)}(\mu_{n+1}^{(j)}\tau_{n+1}^{-r}\otimes\tau_{m+1}^{-s}\delta_{m+1}^{(i)})$$

$$+\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{r=0}^{n}\sum_{s=0}^{m-i}\sum_{j=0}^{s-1} k^{(r,s-1)}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r}\otimes\mu_{m+1}^{(j)}\tau_{m+1}^{-s}\delta_{m+1}^{(i)}) + \sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{r=0}^{n}\sum_{s=0}^{m-i}\sum_{j=s}^{m-1} k^{(r,s)}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r}\otimes\mu_{m+1}^{(j)}\tau_{m+1}^{-s}\delta_{m+1}^{(i)})$$

A long calculation, involving the formulas

$$\mu_{n+1}^{(j)}\tau_{n+1}^{-r} = \begin{cases} \tau_n^{1-r}\mu_{n+1}^{(n+1+j-r)} & r > j \\ \tau_n^{-r}\mu_{n+1}^{(j-r)} & r \leq j \end{cases} \tag{3.4}$$

and

$$\mu_{n+1}^{(j)}\delta_{n+1}^{(i)} = \begin{cases} -\delta_n^{(i-1)}\mu_{n+1}^{(j)} & 0 \leq j < i-1 \leq n-1 \\ -\delta_n^{(i)}\mu_{n+1}^{(j)} & 0 \leq i < j \leq n-1 \\ -\delta_n^{(i)}\mu_{n+1}^{(n)} & 1 \leq i \leq n-1, j = n \\ -\mu_{n+1}^{(i)}\delta_{n+1}^{(i+1)} - \delta_n^{(i)}\mu_{n+1}^{(i)} & 0 \leq i = j \leq n \end{cases} \tag{3.5}$$

(cf. [10, Appendix B]), as well as the following obvious fact

$$K = \sum_{r=0}^{n}\sum_{s=0}^{m} k^{(r,s)}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r}\otimes\tau_{m+1}^{-s}) \tag{3.6}$$

shows then that $-b(\mu)^{\dagger}H$ equals

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{r=0}^{n-i}\sum_{s=0}^{m}\mu^{(r+s+1)}k_0^{(r,s)}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r}\delta_{n+1}^{(i)}\otimes\tau_{m+1}^{-s}) + \sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{r=0}^{n}\sum_{s=0}^{m-i}\mu^{(r+s+1)}k_0^{(r,s)}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r}\otimes\tau_{m+1}^{-s}\delta_{m+1}^{(i)})$$
$$+H(b(\mu)\otimes 1 + 1\otimes b(\mu)) + K(U\otimes 1 + 1\otimes U)$$

Thus, to complete the proof of Lemma 3.3 it remains to prove that

(3.7)

$$-Vk = \sum_{r=0}^{n-1}\sum_{s=0}^{m}\sum_{i=1}^{n-r}\mu^{(r+s+1)}k_0^{(r,s)}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r}\delta_{n+1}^{(i)}\otimes\tau_{m+1}^{-s}) + \sum_{r=0}^{n}\sum_{s=0}^{m-1}\sum_{i=1}^{m-s}\mu^{(r+s+1)}k_0^{(r,s)}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r}\otimes\tau_{m+1}^{-s}\delta_{m+1}^{(i)})$$

(we have changed the order of summation in the original expression).

Set $\tilde{k}_0^{(r,s)} := \mu^{(r+s+1)}k_0^{(r,s)}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r}\otimes\tau_{m+1}^{-s})$. That is, modulo signs,

$$\tilde{k}_0^{(r,s)}(a_0'[a_1'|\ldots|a_n']\otimes a_0''[a_1''|\ldots|a_m''])$$
$$= \pm\mathbf{1}\,\underbrace{[a_{n-r+1}'|\ldots|a_n'|a_{m-s+1}''|\ldots|a_m''}_{\text{sum over }(r,s)-\text{shuffles}}|a_0'a_0''|\underbrace{a_1'|\ldots|a_{n-r}'|a_1''|\ldots|a_{m-s}'']}_{\text{sum over }(n-r,m-s)-\text{shuffles}}$$

It can be shown that

$$\sum_{r=0}^{n-1}\sum_{s=0}^{m}\sum_{i=1}^{n-r}\tilde{k}_0^{(r,s)}(\delta_{n+1}^{(i)}\otimes 1) + \sum_{r=0}^{n}\sum_{s=0}^{m-1}\sum_{i=1}^{m-s}\tilde{k}_0^{(r,s)}(1\otimes\delta_{m+1}^{(i)}) = -\sum_{r=0}^{n}\sum_{s=0}^{m}\sum_{i=r+s+2}^{n+m+1}\delta_{n+m+2}^{(i)}\tilde{k}_0^{(r,s)} \tag{3.8}$$

and

$$-\tau_{n+m+1}^{-j}k = \sum_{r+s=j,\, r\leq n,\, s\leq m}\mu_{n+m+2}^{(0)}\tilde{k}_0^{(r,s)} \quad (0\leq j\leq n+m)$$

This, together with (3.5) and the fact that $h_{n+m+1}\mu^{(0)}_{n+m+2}(x) = x$ for $x = \mathbf{1}[\dots]$, implies

$$\begin{aligned}
-Vk = -h_{n+m+1}\sum_{i=1}^{n+m}\sum_{j=0}^{n+m-i}\tau^{-j}_{n+m+1}\delta^{(i)}_{n+m+1}k &= -h_{n+m+1}\sum_{i=1}^{n+m}\sum_{j=0}^{n+m-i}\delta^{(i+j)}_{n+m+1}\tau^{-j}_{n+m+1}k \\
&= h_{n+m+1}\sum_{i=1}^{n+m}\sum_{j=0}^{n+m-i}\sum_{r+s=j,\, r\leq n,\, s\leq m}\delta^{(i+j)}_{n+m+1}\mu^{(0)}_{n+m+2}\tilde{k}^{(r,s)}_0 \\
&= -h_{n+m+1}\sum_{i=1}^{n+m}\sum_{j=0}^{n+m-i}\sum_{r+s=j,\, r\leq n,\, s\leq m}\mu^{(0)}_{n+m+2}\delta^{(i+j+1)}_{n+m+2}\tilde{k}^{(r,s)}_0 \\
&= -\sum_{i=1}^{n+m}\sum_{j=0}^{n+m-i}\sum_{r+s=j,\, r\leq n,\, s\leq m}\delta^{(i+j+1)}_{n+m+2}\tilde{k}^{(r,s)}_0
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to compare the latter expression to the right-hand side of (3.8). It is enough to show that

$$\sum_{r=0}^{n}\sum_{s=0}^{m}\sum_{i=r+s+2}^{n+m+1}A(i,r,s) = \sum_{i=1}^{n+m}\sum_{j=0}^{n+m-i}\sum_{r+s=j,\, r\leq n,\, s\leq m}A(i+j+1,r,s)$$

for abstract variables $A(x,y,z)$. Changing the order of summation in the right-hand side and shifting the first argument transforms this identity into the following obvious one:

$$\sum_{r=0}^{n}\sum_{s=0}^{m}\sum_{i=r+s+2}^{n+m+1}A(i,r,s) = \sum_{j=0}^{n+m-1}\sum_{r+s=j,\, r\leq n,\, s\leq m}\sum_{i=j+2}^{n+m+1}A(i,r,s)$$

This finishes the proof of Lemma 3.3. ■

**Lemma 3.4.**

$$-k(V\otimes 1 + 1\otimes V) + UK = \mu^{(0)}H + \mu^{(*)}H - k(b(\delta)\otimes B)$$

**Proof.** The expression for $\mu^{(0)}k^{(r,s)}(a'_0[a'_1|\dots|a'_n]\otimes a''_0[a''_1|\dots|a''_m])$ involves tensors of two types, namely, the ones that begin with $a'_0$ and the ones that begin with $a''_0$. Let us denote the corresponding operators by $\mu^{(0)}k^{(r,s)\prime}$ and $\mu^{(0)}k^{(r,s)\prime\prime}$; that is,

$$\mu^{(0)}k^{(r,s)} = \mu^{(0)}k^{(r,s)\prime} + \mu^{(0)}k^{(r,s)\prime\prime}$$

Similarly,

$$\mu^{(*)}k^{(r,s)} = \mu^{(*)}k^{(r,s)\prime} + \mu^{(*)}k^{(r,s)\prime\prime}$$

with $\mu^{(*)}k^{(r,s)\prime}, \mu^{(*)}k^{(r,s)\prime\prime}$ having the similar meaning. The key observation is that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu^{(*)}k^{(r,s)\prime} &= -\mu^{(0)}k^{(r+1,s)\prime}(\tau^{-1}_{n+1}\otimes 1) \quad (r\leq n-1) \\
\mu^{(*)}k^{(r,s)\prime\prime} &= -\mu^{(0)}k^{(r,s+1)\prime\prime}(1\otimes\tau^{-1}_{m+1}) \quad (s\leq m-1) \\
\mu^{(*)}k^{(n,s)\prime} &= 0, \quad \mu^{(0)}k^{(r,0)\prime\prime} = 0
\end{aligned}$$

The formulas imply that for $i = 1, \dots, n$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{r=0}^{n-i}\sum_{s=0}^{m} \mu^{(0)} k^{(r,s)}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r} \otimes \tau_{m+1}^{-s}) + \sum_{r=0}^{n-i}\sum_{s=0}^{m} \mu^{(*)} k^{(r,s)}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r} \otimes \tau_{m+1}^{-s}) \\
&\qquad = \sum_{s=0}^{m} \mu^{(0)} k^{(0,s)\prime}(1 \otimes \tau_{m+1}^{-s}) - \sum_{s=0}^{m} \mu^{(0)} k^{(n-i+1,s)\prime}(\tau_{n+1}^{i} \otimes \tau_{m+1}^{-s}) \\
&\qquad\qquad + \sum_{r=0}^{n-i} \mu^{(*)} k^{(r,m)\prime\prime}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r} \otimes \tau_{m+1}^{-m})
\end{aligned}$$

and for $i = 1, \dots, m$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{r=0}^{n}\sum_{s=0}^{m-i} \mu^{(0)} k^{(r,s)}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r} \otimes \tau_{m+1}^{-s}) + \sum_{r=0}^{n}\sum_{s=0}^{m-i} \mu^{(*)} k^{(r,s)}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r} \otimes \tau_{m+1}^{-s}) \\
&\qquad = \sum_{s=0}^{m-i} \mu^{(0)} k^{(0,s)\prime}(1 \otimes \tau_{m+1}^{-s}) - \sum_{r=0}^{n} \mu^{(0)} k^{(r,m-i+1)\prime\prime}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r} \otimes \tau_{m+1}^{i})
\end{aligned}$$

Using these equalities, it is easy to show that

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\mu^{(0)} H - \mu^{(*)} H \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{r=0}^{n-i} \mu^{(*)} k^{(r,m)\prime\prime}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r}\delta_{n+1}^{(i)} \otimes \tau_{m+1}) + \sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{s=0}^{m-i} \mu^{(0)} k^{(0,s)\prime}(1 \otimes \tau_{m+1}^{-s}\delta_{m+1}^{(i)}) \\
&- \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{s=0}^{m} \mu^{(0)} k^{(i,s)\prime}(\delta_{n+1}^{(0)}\tau_{n+1}^{-i} \otimes \tau_{m+1}^{-s}) - \sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{r=0}^{n} \mu^{(0)} k^{(r,i)\prime\prime}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r} \otimes \delta_{m+1}^{(0)}\tau_{m+1}^{-i}) \\
&+ \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{s=0}^{m} \mu^{(0)} k^{(0,s)\prime}(\delta_{n+1}^{(i)} \otimes \tau_{m+1}^{-s})
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by (3.6) and the definition of $k^{(r,s)\prime}$ and $k^{(r,s)\prime\prime}$

$$\begin{aligned}
-UK &= \sum_{r=0}^{n}\sum_{s=0}^{m} \delta^{(0)}\mu^{(0)} k^{(r,s)}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r} \otimes \tau_{m+1}^{-s}) \\
&= \sum_{r=0}^{n}\sum_{s=0}^{m} \delta^{(0)}\mu^{(0)} k^{(r,s)\prime}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r} \otimes \tau_{m+1}^{-s}) + \sum_{r=0}^{n}\sum_{s=1}^{m} \delta^{(0)}\mu^{(0)} k^{(r,s)\prime\prime}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r} \otimes \tau_{m+1}^{-s}) \\
&= -\sum_{r=0}^{n}\sum_{s=0}^{m} \mu^{(0)} k^{(r,s)\prime}(\delta_{n+1}^{(0)}\tau_{n+1}^{-r} \otimes \tau_{m+1}^{-s}) - \sum_{r=0}^{n}\sum_{s=1}^{m} \mu^{(0)} k^{(r,s)\prime\prime}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r} \otimes \delta_{m+1}^{(0)}\tau_{m+1}^{-s})
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}&-\mu^{(0)}H-\mu^{(*)}H+UK\\ &=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{r=0}^{n-i}\mu^{(*)}k^{(r,m)\prime\prime}(\tau_{n+1}^{-r}\delta_{n+1}^{(i)}\otimes\tau_{m+1})+\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{s=0}^{m-i}\mu^{(0)}k^{(0,s)\prime}(1\otimes\tau_{m+1}^{-s}\delta_{m+1}^{(i)})\\ &\quad+\sum_{s=0}^{m}\mu^{(0)}k^{(0,s)\prime}(b(\delta)_{n+1}\otimes\tau_{m+1}^{-s})\end{aligned}$$

To finish the proof, it remains to observe that for all $r,s$

$$\mu^{(*)}k^{(r,m)\prime\prime}(1\otimes\tau_{m+1})=k(h_{n+1}\otimes 1),\quad \mu^{(0)}k^{(0,s)\prime}=k(1\otimes h_{m+1})$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}&-\mu^{(0)}H-\mu^{(*)}H+UK\\ &=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{r=0}^{n-i}k(h_{n+1}\tau_{n+1}^{-r}\delta_{n+1}^{(i)}\otimes 1)+\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{s=0}^{m-i}k(1\otimes h_{m+1}\tau_{m+1}^{-s}\delta_{m+1}^{(i)})\\ &-\sum_{s=0}^{m}k(b(\delta)_{n+1}\otimes h_{m+1}\tau_{m+1}^{-s})=k(V\otimes 1+1\otimes V)-k(b(\delta)\otimes B)\end{aligned}$$

■

Combining the results of Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4 we obtain

$$[V,k]+[U,K]=(b+uB)H+H((b+uB)\otimes 1+1\otimes(b+uB))-k(b(\delta)\otimes B)$$

Thus, to finish the proof of Proposition 3.2 it is enough to show that the operator $k(b(\delta)\otimes B)$ is homotopic to 0. Since we are working with the normalized complexes,

$$k(b(\delta)\otimes B)=(k+uK)(b(\delta)\otimes B)=(k+uK)(b(\delta)\otimes 1)(1\otimes B)$$

So, it suffices to observe that the operators $k+uK$ and $1\otimes B$ (anti-)commute with the cyclic differential while $b(\delta)\otimes 1$ can be written as the commutator $[b+uB,H']$ (see (2.6)).

## References

[1] T. Dyckerhoff, Compact generators in categories of matrix factorizations. Duke Math. J. 159 (2011), no. 2, 223-274.

[2] E. Getzler, Cartan homotopy formulas and the Gauss-Manin connection in cyclic homology. (English summary) Quantum deformations of algebras and their representations (Ramat-Gan, 1991/1992; Rehovot, 1991/1992), 65-78, Israel Math. Conf. Proc., 7, Bar-Ilan Univ., Ramat Gan, 1993.

[3] Ch. E. Hood, J. D. S. Jones, Some algebraic properties of cyclic homology groups. K-Theory 1 (1987), no. 4, 361-384.

[4] L. Katzarkov, M. Kontsevich, T. Pantev, Hodge theoretic aspects of mirror symmetry. From Hodge theory to integrability and TQFT $tt^*$-geometry, 87-174, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., 78, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2008.

[5] M. Kontsevich, XI Solomon Lefschetz Memorial Lecture series: Hodge structures in non-commutative geometry. Notes by Ernesto Lupercio. Contemp. Math., 462, Non-commutative geometry in mathematics and physics, 1-21, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2008.

[6] M. Kontsevich, Y. Soibelman, Notes on $A_\infty$-algebras, $A_\infty$-categories and non-commutative geometry. Homological mirror symmetry, 153-219, Lecture Notes in Phys., 757, Springer, Berlin, 2009.

[7] J.-L. Loday, Cyclic homology. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, 301. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992.

[8] C. Sabbah, Hypergeometric periods for a tame polynomial, Port. Math., 63 (2006), 173–226.

[9] J. Scherk, J. H. M. Steenbrink, On the mixed Hodge structure on the cohomology of the Milnor fibre, Math. Ann. 271 (1985), no. 4, 641-665.

[10] D. Shklyarov, Non-commutative Hodge structures: Towards matching categorical and geometric examples. arXiv:1107.3156

[11] B. Tsygan, Cyclic homology. Cyclic homology in noncommutative geometry, 73-113, Encyclopaedia Math. Sci., 121, Springer, Berlin, 2004.

*E-mail address*: `dmytro.shklyarov@math.uni-augsburg.de`